

01203DIV2

B/K
APP
7/24/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: :
Tristan BARBEYRON et al. : EXAMINER: PATTERSON, C.L.
SERIAL NO.: 09/988,201 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1652
FILED: November 19, 2001 :

COPIES 17

FOR: GLYCOSYL HYDROLASE GENES AND THEIR USE FOR PRODUCING
ENZYMES FOR THE BIO-DEGRADATION OF CARRAGEENANS

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This is in response to the requirement for restriction that was made under 35 U.S.C.
§§121 and 372 on April 7, 2003, the period for response having been extended from May 7,
2003 to August 7, 2003 by a Petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time incorporated
herewith.

The Office has required restriction in the present application as follows:

Group I, claims 12-18, drawn to a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:5 and a nucleic acid
encoding a protein of SEQ ID NO:6, a vector containing the nucleic acid, a host cell
containing the nucleic acid and a method of making an enzyme by using the host cell.

Group II, claims 12-18, drawn to a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:7 and a nucleic acid
encoding a protein of SEQ ID NO:8, a vector containing the nucleic acid, a host cell
containing the nucleic acid and a method of making an enzyme by using the host cell.

Furthermore, the Examiner notes that claim 17 of USSN 09/988,202, limited to either

LAW OFFICES
DENISON, SCHULTZ & DOUGHERTY
12 CRYSTAL SQUARE 4
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-3417
703 412-1155
07/25/2003
01 12:1253

VILLARI 00000002 09988201

-1-

930.00 OP

SEQ ID NO: 5 or 7, could be examined with this application.

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute, with traverse, the invention of Group I, claims 12-18, drawn to a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:5 and a nucleic acid encoding a protein of SEQ ID NO:6, a vector containing the nucleic acid, a host cell containing the nucleic acid and a method of making an enzyme by using the host cell.

Applicants' election is made with traverse for the following reasons:

The Office has analyzed the present claims under the unity rules of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT). However, this application is a divisional application of U.S. national phase application Serial No. 09/269,731, and therefore should not be subject to the unity requirements set out in PCT Rules 13.1-13.4 and 37 C.F.R. §1.475. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is unsustainable, and it should therefore be withdrawn.

Furthermore, restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are either independent or patentably distinct, and there is a burden in searching the entire application. MPEP §803. Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement on the grounds that the Office has not provided adequate reasons and/or examples to support its conclusion of patentable distinctness or shown that a burden exists in searching all the claims.

The Office has characterized the inventions of Groups I and II as distinct because the "nucleic acids of SEQ ID NO:5 and 7 are completely structurally different." Page 2, 6th paragraph, of the Official Action. While Applicants take note that nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally different chemical compounds and would normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121,

as stated in MPEP §803.04, the Commissioner has partially waived the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.141 *et seq.* to permit a "reasonable number" of such nucleotide sequences to be claimed in a single application. See *Examination of Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequences*, 1192 O.G. 68 (November 19, 1996). As noted in MPEP §803.04, up to ten nucleotide sequences constitute a reasonable number for examination purposes, and must be examined in a single application without restriction. Accordingly, a mere structural difference of the claimed nucleotide sequences is not a valid basis for restriction. The restriction requirement is therefore believed to be improper, and it should be withdrawn.

Applicants also respectfully traverse the restriction requirement on the grounds that the Office has not shown even a *prima facie* case that a serious burden would be placed on the Examiner if the inventions of Groups I and II were to be examined together. Accordingly, since it has not been shown by the Office that a serious burden would be placed on the Examiner if the inventions of Groups I and II were to be examined together, Applicants submit that restriction cannot be properly maintained between Groups I and II. The restriction requirement is clearly improper, and it should be withdrawn.

Applicants also submit that new claims 19 and 20 added by the concurrently filed Supplemental Preliminary Amendment in the above-identified application, should be properly examined along with claims 12-18.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Applicants hereby petition the Commissioner for Patents to extend the time for reply to the Official Action dated March 25, 2003 for three (3) months from May 7,

2003 to August 7, 2003. A duly completed credit card authorization form is attached to effect payment of the extension fee.

Respectfully submitted

Malcolm J. MacDonald

July 17, 2003

Malcolm J. MacDonald
Reg. No. 40,250
Tel: (703) 412-1155 Ex. 24